



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,428	01/12/2004	Roberto Pedros	2331 CON2 (203-2539CON2)	9696
Covidien 60 Middletown Avenue North Haven, CT 06473				
7550	01/16/2009		EXAMINER TYSON, MELANIE RUANO	
			ART UNIT 3773	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/16/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/755,428

**Applicant(s)**

PEDROS ET AL.

**Examiner**

Melanie Tyson

**Art Unit**

3773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08 October 2008 has been entered. Claims 1-9 remain canceled.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 10, 11, 14-19, and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,290,299). Fain discloses an apparatus (see entire document) comprising a housing (38), at least two tissue engaging members (44) being longitudinally, reciprocally (via manually operative deployment movable member 42), and radially outward movable relative to the housing and having sharpened ends (for example, see Figure 6A), at least two jaw members (48) being independently

movable (open/close via trigger, or movable actuator, 46), an elongated shaft (40) having a longitudinal slot (lumen), and an attachment member (20, 22). Regarding claim 11, the tissue engaging members have a shape and are formed of a material, thus are considered a shape member material as claimed. Regarding claims 17 and 18, the attachment member is formed of metal material, thus is conductive and adapted to transmit thermal energy through application of an energy source thereto as claimed. The introductory statement of intended use and other functional language have been carefully considered, but deemed not to impose any structural limitations on the claims to make them patentably distinguishable over Fain's device, which is capable of being used as claimed if one desires to do so.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**Claim 20** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Fain et al.** Fain discloses the claimed invention except for the mechanism utilized for biasing the jaw members. It is well known in the art to use spring members with actuators, for example, clip applicers, in order to bias the jaws of the device into either an open position as disclosed by Fain, or a closed position as in the case in the present application. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Fain's device with a spring member to bias the jaw members into a closed position.

**Claims 12 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Fain et al. in view of Leopold (U.S. Patent No. 3,364,933)**. Fain discloses the claimed invention except for hook or J-shaped tissue engaging members. Leopold discloses tissue engaging members (see entire document). Leopold teaches the tissue engaging members are hook or J-shaped (for example, see Figure 2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form Fain's tissue engaging members having a hook or J-shape as taught by Leopold. Doing so would enable proper tissue engagement of tissue that required such a shape for grasping.

**Claim 21** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Fain et al. in view of Petruzzi (U.S. Patent No. 4,655,219)**. Fain discloses the claimed invention except for engaging members that curve in opposite directions. Petruzzi discloses tissue engaging members (see entire document). Petruzzi teaches the tissue engaging members are curved in opposite directions (for example, see Figure 6;

members curve outward in different directions). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form Fain's tissue engaging members curving in different directions as taught by Petruzzi. Doing so would enable proper tissue engagement of tissue that required such a shape for grasping.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 10 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,248,124. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the '124 reference discloses all of the limitations found in claim 10 except for the addition of an electrode. Not using an electrode and merely using a housing, two tissue engaging members and two jaw members is considered obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art because a vessel opening can be closed with only those elements.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melanie Tyson whose telephone number is (571)272-9062. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:30-7 (max flex).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jackie Ho can be reached on (571) 272-4696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Melanie Tyson /M. T./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3773  
January 9, 2009

Application/Control Number: 10/755,428  
Art Unit: 3773

Page 7

/(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3773